

DIFFERENTIAL CULTURE CHANGE: REPORT ON THE INTERUNIVERSITY SUMMER RESEARCH SEMINAR, 1956

by Edward M. Bruner

THE interuniversity summer research seminar on differential culture change met at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque during July and August 1956. A brief review of previous projects in the field of acculturation sponsored by the Social Science Research Council will help to place the 1956 seminar in historical perspective.

In 1935 Robert Redfield, Melville J. Herskovits, and Ralph Linton were appointed a Subcommittee on Acculturation of the Council's Committee on Personality and Culture. They prepared a now classic document which defined and legitimized acculturation studies for American anthropologists. This statement,¹ which was widely reprinted both in this country and abroad, gave great impetus to research on acculturation. In 1953 the Council supported an interuniversity summer research seminar devoted to a conceptual assessment and codification of the abundant empirical data on acculturation, most of which had been gathered within the last two decades. The efforts of the 1953 seminar were explicitly theoretical. In a "Methodological Note" in their published report² the participants stated, "The next step is obviously one of continuing research enterprises."

The 1956 seminar took this obvious next step. Our aim was to bring a specific body of comparative data to bear upon one carefully defined acculturation problem, and to isolate general propositions concerning cultural process from these data. The problem selected was dif-

ferential culture change, which we examined in terms of the data from six American Indian cases.

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Stemming from the finding that most cultures have undergone more extensive and rapid change in some aspects of life than in others, the problem of differential change may be divided into the following components: (a) which segments of culture change readily and which are resistant to change, (b) how we explain those changes that have occurred and those that have not, and (c) what effects the changes have upon the larger cultural system of which they are a part.

Many hypotheses in the literature of anthropology and of other social sciences are offered as explanations of differential culture change. Some are cast in terms of content categories of culture, for example, material culture changes more readily than nonmaterial culture, or the value system is more resistant to change than the economic system. Other hypotheses are of a more general nature; for example, if a complex is functional, or if it continues to have utility, or if it is firmly integrated with a larger culture pattern, or if it is learned early in childhood in a situation of positive affect, then the complex tends to persist in contact situations. These and other hypotheses relate to many aspects of social science theory concerned with cultural dynamics and process.

SEMINAR PROCEDURE

We chose to study differential change among American Indians because each participant in the seminar

¹ "Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation," *American Anthropologist*, January-March 1936, pp. 149-152.

² Leonard Broom, Bernard J. Siegel, Evon Z. Vogt, and James B. Watson, "Acculturation: An Exploratory Formulation," *American Anthropologist*, December 1954, pp. 973-1002.

had had several years of active research experience gathering firsthand field materials on one tribe; and a detailed comparison of the similarities and differences in the sequence of cultural change in six Indian groups provided some degree of methodological control. The participants and their respective subjects of study were: Edward H. Spicer of the University of Arizona (chairman), Yaqui of Arizona and Mexico; Helen Codere of Vassar College, Kwakiutl of the Northwest Coast; Edward Dozier of Northwestern University, Rio Grande Pueblos of New Mexico; David French of Reed College, Wasco of Oregon; Evon Z. Vogt of Harvard University, Navaho of New Mexico and Arizona; and Edward M. Bruner of Yale University, Mandan of North Dakota.³ Aboriginally these six Indian groups were all nonliterate folk cultures. Today they find themselves in a roughly comparable situation: they are enclaved minorities surrounded by a more powerful alien culture, their administration has been in the hands of an external bureaucracy, and they are subject to characteristic American attitudes toward dark-skinned peoples. We believed this comparability would enable us to control some of the significant variables so that our comparisons might yield general propositions.

During the first week of the seminar we established a rough scheme of analysis; in the second week we had no formal meetings but prepared our case materials; in the third, fourth, and fifth weeks we presented our data to the group, allowing two to three days, or about fifteen hours of lecture and discussion, for each case; and during the sixth and seventh weeks we revised our categories and evaluated the results.

PROBLEMS AND SCOPE OF THE SEMINAR

Two general problems will be discussed briefly here to give some indication of the scope of the seminar. The first concerns the balance between the nature of the Indian culture and the contact conditions as sources of explanation of cultural change. We know, for example, that the early Spaniards in Mexico were more interested in changing native religion than technology, while the French fur traders of the northern Plains had little interest in religion but did introduce vast changes in the native economy. As a direct result of the aspirations of the first contacting agents the Indians of Mexico underwent ceremonial change with technological stability, and the Plains Indians the reverse. However, the Spanish missionaries and the French fur traders had more success among some cultures than others, which suggests that factors inherent in the Indian cultures themselves are

also significant in determining persistence and change. Both intrinsic characteristics of the native culture and the conditions of contact must be considered in attempting to explain differential culture change.

Some previous studies of acculturation of American Indians have tended to view the Indian culture as if it existed in isolation, independent of the larger community which surrounds it; other such studies have presented the contacting culture as if it consisted entirely of outside agents impinging upon the native society. That we attempted to describe the two cultures in contact as one larger system emerges from our outline for the organization of the data.

The material for each case was divided into historical periods, beginning with the earliest documentary evidence and in some cases with archaeological findings. In most cases there were four or five periods, established on the basis of culturally significant time, that is, important from the viewpoint of the Indian culture. For the recent period our data were from our own field studies, but for the earlier periods we used all the available historical sources. The project involved an exhaustive study of documents, reports of missionaries, fur traders' diaries, and government agents' records. In this perspective we have dealt with a chapter of American history.

For each historical period we described what we termed the "contact community," covering the following features:

- (1) Community organization—all the significant social groups in contact as perceived by the Indian people; the demography and settlement pattern of these groups.
- (2) External social relationships—strategy of each group toward the others; intergroup attitudes; network of intercultural roles; situational context for roles.
- (3) Internal social organization—economic, kinship, political, and ceremonial organization; social stratification; life cycle.
- (4) Other aspects of culture—supernatural and non-supernatural knowledge; art; recreation; language; orientations; values.

Following the description of the contact community in each historical period, we analyzed cultural change and persistence in terms of the processes of integration. This brings us to the second general problem to be discussed in this report: that analyses of change limited to identification and descriptions of the new elements that have been accepted and those that have been rejected are not sufficient. For example, Yaqui and Rio Grande Pueblo ceremonialism include both native and Catholic elements. An enumeration of the Catholic aspects would be quite similar for both groups; yet there are vast differences in the integration of ceremonial items. In brief, the Yaqui have a fusional integration, in which native

³ Ronald Kurtz, graduate student in anthropology at the University of New Mexico, served as recorder for the seminar.

and Catholic aspects are firmly interconnected in any given ceremony and in Yaqui belief, while the Pueblo have an isolative integration, in which native and Catholic aspects are sharply differentiated and compartmentalized. Among the Pueblos, aboriginal religious ceremonies are held in the *kiva* in the center of the village, are conducted in the Pueblo language, and are attended only by Indian people. Pueblo Catholic ceremonies are held in a church on the outskirts of the village, are conducted in English, and are attended by both Indians and whites.⁴

Analyses on the level of integrative processes provided one way of comparing the sequence of cultural change among six diverse Indian groups. For instance, our data suggest that the Mandan in 1900 adopted the same isolative process of integration that the Pueblo did in 1700. The explanation appears to be due to similarities in the two cultures, for example, in the village orientation and in aspects of social organization and value system, combined with similarities in the conditions of contact, for example, the use of force by administrators to change the Indian culture. We attempted to delineate the conditions that lead to acceptance or rejection, and the conditions for the adoption of one integrative process rather than another.

With regard to the use of force by the contacting agents to bring about change, our comparative data suggest the following preliminary finding: The greatest change has occurred when either no force has been applied, as in the case of Wasco and Kwakiutl, or when the force has been so brutal and effective as to destroy completely the native culture. There are of course no present-day examples of the latter, but instances can be found in the historical record. Any compromise between these two extremes leads to persistence of aspects of the Indian culture, for example, Rio Grande Pueblo, Mandan, and Yaqui, at different historical periods.

We noted a consistency through time in the type of integrative process characteristic of each Indian culture. This was an unanticipated empirical finding. To draw a complex analogy, let us assume that a social scientist, upon returning from his summer vacation, finds on

⁴ Additional information on this comparison will be presented in a separate paper to be published by Edward H. Spicer and Edward Dozier.

his desk invitations to lecture before various women's clubs, to join an administrative committee of his university, and to run for political office in his community. These invitations draw him away from what he had been before—a research worker. In this situation the Yaqui Indian would accept every invitation but would also continue his research; each activity would be well organized and successful. The Pueblo would probably refuse all invitations so as to remain a pure scientist, but even if he did accept just one he would never lose his research perspective. The Wasco would accept all invitations, but would perform each activity so differently, depending upon his audience, that he would never be entirely clear as to his own identity—ladies' club lecturer or research worker. The Kwakiutl would accept the most lucrative offer after bargaining for the price, would insist on being introduced as a famous lecturer, and would eventually drop his research. The Mandan would accept some invitations but would write at least one good scientific paper a year; his adjustment would be similar to that of the Pueblo except that he would not produce as much. The Navaho would not understand the invitations, and would leave at the first opportunity for another vacation.

PLANS FOR A FINAL REPORT

As to the yield of the project, aside from our own education and benefits to our research, we now plan to produce a book organized as was the seminar itself. An introductory statement of the problem will be followed by six case studies as independently written chapters. The conclusion of the book will consist of a theoretical discussion and summary stemming directly from the case material. Edward H. Spicer, who served as chairman of the seminar, will be the editor of the volume.

Thus, the interuniversity seminar on differential culture change continues during the academic year at our own universities as we prepare our case studies for publication. This progress report has given but a brief picture of what all participants found to be a personally rewarding experience; the final evaluation of the intellectual success of our efforts must await the judgment of the profession at large after the results are published.

LAW AND SOCIAL RELATIONS: A REPORT ON THE SUMMER RESEARCH TRAINING INSTITUTE, 1956

by E. Adamson Hoebel *

THE research training institute on law and social relations was held at the Law School of Harvard University from June 25 to August 10, 1956. The staff consisted of Harold J. Berman, Professor of Law at Harvard, and the author as co-directors in residence for the duration of the institute. Karl N. Llewellyn, Soia Mentschikoff, and David Riesman, all of the University of Chicago, served as guest staff members during the fifth and sixth weeks, and Willard Hurst of the University of Wisconsin performed a like service in the seventh week.

The institute was fortunate in the quality of its 15 participants. They represented an extraordinary level of intellectual ability and diversity of experience combined with genuine common interest and orientation toward the purposes of the institute. Preference in the selection of participants had been given to candidates who had completed graduate training in their central field. As a result, 10 participants held academic appointments at the level of assistant professor or higher; two were advanced graduate students. Five participants are political scientists, five are sociologists, four are from anthropology, and one from law. A disappointing factor, in terms of the goals of the institute, was the lack of response by young law teachers and research men. Although some 40 applications were received and considered, less than 10 percent came from members of law school faculties. Does this represent a lack of interest in nontraditional areas of legal research? Or is it the result of failure to reach the law school faculties with the announcement of the program? It would be important in the planning of future work to know the answer.

A quite unexpected feature of the background of the participants is the fact that in addition to the one law participant four of them (two political scientists, two sociologists) hold the LL.B. The ratio was, naturally, not this high among the total group of candidates, but in any event there is evidence of more law training among younger social scientists than had been sus-

pected. Stimulated to bring both areas of training to bear in social science research, such men can provide a valuable core of research personnel. One clear achievement of the institute was to bring some of these men together in a way that encouraged the use of their backgrounds for interstimulation—a process that they do not under normal circumstances have the opportunity to enjoy.

The immediate goals of the institute were twofold: (1) to initiate the training and, through such training, the recruitment of scholars of superior competence equipped to advance research in the area of law and social relations; (2) to make a beginning on the formulation and improvement of concepts and methods for research on law and society.

Four lines of approach were used in the institute. To provide the participants with training in legal concepts and techniques of case analysis, Berman presented a selected body of case materials (mostly from American courts) centering on the questions of justiciability and the synthesis of decisions. Simultaneously, Hoebel presented the methods and materials of culture theory and anthropological jurisprudence as representative of a developed methodology in the social sciences for investigation of law in society.

These two basic training courses ran daily and intensively for four weeks. The interaction of the legal and social science points of view and assumptions was effective throughout, generating a wealth of ideas and a strong enthusiasm. The method in both courses was dialectic and of the seminar type, rather than a series of lectures.

The third line of approach was through seminar treatment of special topics of socio-legal research under the aegis of the guest staff. Berman set the stage for the first week of Mentschikoff's analysis of the interplay of social and legal forces in the development of labor law and governmental control of labor relations. Berman had closed his presentation with discussion of key nineteenth and early twentieth century labor cases that set the judicial premises for labor-employer relations. These cases lucidly demonstrated the limitations of legal doctrine too rigidly based on premises unsuited to rapidly changing social conditions. Mentschikoff's multiphasal, functional analysis of what happened in the practical shaping of the regulatory machinery subsequent to the passage of the Wagner Act was a demonstration of socio-

* The author is Professor of Anthropology at the University of Minnesota and a member of the board of directors of the Council, at whose annual meeting in September 1956 he presented a preliminary version of the present report. The institute was sponsored by the Council's Committee on Research Training, as announced in *Items*, March 1956, p. 10. The participants are listed in the Council's *Annual Report 1955-56*, pp. 84-85. Readers may be interested also in the report of the co-director of the institute, Harold J. Berman, "An Institute on Law and Social Relations," *Harvard Law School Bulletin*, December 1956, pp. 5-6, 21.

legal scholarship perfectly suited to the purposes of the institute. Simultaneously, during the fifth week Llewellyn explored his current concepts of "law-government" as fundamental tools for socio-legal research, building from the dynamics of institutional organization and functioning in social systems.

In the sixth week Mentschikoff demonstrated the application of Llewellyn's type of approach to a specific research project through a step-by-step descriptive analysis of the research techniques that have been worked out in the Arbitration Study at the Chicago Law School. Concurrently, Riesman led the group into an examination of problems posed in the study of the American legal profession as a subculture within the whole, and the "child training" of lawyers in their profession. Each series of sessions was empirically oriented to behavioral research utilizing all the resources of law and the social sciences, thus serving as experimental demonstrations.

In the seventh and final week the series of seminars led by guests achieved an effective closure in Hurst's use of the case method of analysis of decisions—his own inimitable application of the question, "What can you tell about the nature of the society as of the time of this action, by what can be read in the case record?" In this he brought the seminars back to the case law method familiar to law schools—but the case law method deemphasizing doctrine and equipped with tools for social science analysis. At the same time his approach provided an example of a research method alternative or complementary to the kinds of field research exemplified in the discussions by Mentschikoff and Riesman.

Finally, in the last two weeks and concurrently with the seminar sessions, the participants were organized into three working committees. Committee I assumed the task of preliminary identification of such useful concepts as had come to light during the institute. Committee II undertook the formulation and preliminary design of a research project on one socio-legal topic. The task of

Committee III was the same, but in the comparative field. Representatives of each committee presented their group's findings for round-table discussion by the entire membership. These reports convincingly indicate the rich potential for future research in the area of concern to the institute.

The anticipated results of the institute lie in the future. Its immediate purpose was focused on the training and stimulation of new workers in the socio-legal field, and in this it certainly succeeded. In the first week the sessions attained a high level of intellectual excitement, of which there was no diminution throughout the remaining weeks. The work load was heavy; individual reading and study consistently occupied the participants throughout the afternoons and far into the night. The impact of the institute altered some research career goals of participants, while the institute was still in session.

The institute, of course, did not satisfy all the expectations and desires of the participants. A specific shortcoming of its organization and procedure lay in our failure to provide time and means for thorough analysis and discussion of the participants' current or recent research. Workshop sessions, from which a number of participants hoped to be able to draw criticism leading to further refinement of their thinking, were asked for and expected. The directors were unable to fit these into the crowded schedule, however, and justified disappointments may have resulted.

Whatever other deficiencies may have marked the carrying out of the intention of the institute, we feel confident in reporting to the Council that the experience fulfilled our most sanguine expectations. There is good reason to believe that it has given impetus toward a new level of research on the part of a majority of the participants. It planted seeds that are deserving of further cultivation. Proposals for continuing efforts in this direction will be prepared.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

Ralph G. Hurlin (chairman), Robert W. Burgess, John D. Durand, Ernest M. Fisher, F. F. Hill, Frederick F. Stephan, Conrad Taeuber, Ralph J. Watkins, Paul Webbink.

On December 31, 1956 the committee concluded the program that it had initiated in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census following the 1950 decennial censuses of population and housing. Six monographs, listed on page 11, have been published as of March 1957. Other monographs, publication of which is anticipated in the course of the year,

are as follows (in order of their probable appearance): *Residential Finance in 1950*, by Richard U. Ratcliff, Daniel B. Rathbun, and Junia H. Honnold; *The Older Population of the United States*, by Henry D. Sheldon; *America's Children*, by Eleanor H. Bernert; *Farm Housing*, by Glenn H. Beyer and J. Hugh Rose; *The Changing Population of the United States, 1790-1955*, by Conrad Taeuber and Irene B. Taeuber; *Differential Reproduction*, by Clyde V. Kiser and Wilson H. Grabill; *Population Mobility in the United States*, by Henry S. Shryock, Jr.; and *The American Labor Force*, by Gertrude Bancroft.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Richard Hartshorne, Melville J. Herskovits, Edgar M. Hoover, Bert F. Hoselitz, Wilbert E. Moore, Joseph J. Spengler.

The first of a series of papers by the chairman of the committee, "Quantitative Aspects of the Economic Growth of Nations: Levels and Variability of Rates of Growth," was published in *Economic Growth and Cultural Change*, October 1956. This paper deals with changes over time in the over-all rates of growth of population, national product, and product per capita. It is intended that subsequent papers will deal with long-term trends in industrial distributions of national product and the labor force, in the distribution of the national product by type of use, and in the relative importance of foreign trade and other movements across national boundaries. The January 1957 issue of *Economic Growth and Cultural Change* contains an article by Phyllis Deane, "The Industrial Revolution and Economic Growth: The Evidence of Early British National Income Estimates," which is a report on part of the inquiry into the long-term growth of the United Kingdom sponsored by the committee at the University of Cambridge Department of Applied Economics.

MATHEMATICAL TRAINING

OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

William G. Madow (chairman), Robert R. Bush, W. K. Estes, E. P. Hutchinson, John G. Kemeny, Frederick Mosteller, Howard Raiffa, Robert Solow, Robert M. Thrall; staff, Elbridge Sibley.

As part of its effort to document applications of mathematics in social science research, the committee in the summer of 1954 sponsored the preparation of illustrations of ways in which mathematics has been used in the field of psychology. The resulting manuscript, by Robert R. Bush of the New York School of Social Work, Robert P. Abelson of Yale University, and Ray Hyman of Harvard University, has been reproduced by the Council in a revised form for experimental use in teaching mathematics to social science students. The examples presented are drawn principally from three areas in which it was found that mathematics has had especially wide application: (1) testing and measurement, (2) psychophysics and physiological psychology, and (3) learning. A few examples and problems have been included from research on small groups, sociometry, and related areas of social psychology. Copies of the 92-page manual, *Mathematics for Psychologists: Examples and Problems*, are available from the New York office of the Council at \$2.00.

For lists of persons invited to attend the two summer institutes to be sponsored by the committee in 1957, see pages 9-10 infra.

NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

T. Cuyler Young (chairman), Hamilton A. R. Gibb, J. C. Hurewitz, Majid Khadduri, William D. Schorger, Wilfred C. Smith; staff, Dankwart A. Rustow, Bryce Wood.

Attention has been given by the committee at recent meetings to means of improving current resources for training in certain languages of the Near and Middle East. Arrangements have been made with George Makdisi of the University of Michigan for translation of *Éléments de l'Arabe Classique* by Régis Blachère (4th ed., Paris: Librairie Orientale et Américaine, 1949). On the basis of a survey of materials and methods used in the teaching of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish in this country, which was made for the committee, it has recommended a plan of interuniversity cooperation in summer instruction in these languages.

Another survey has just been carried out for the committee by Harry W. Hazard of Princeton, N. J. to ascertain the sources and extent of information available to libraries in the United States concerning materials on the Near and Middle East that are published abroad. The channels for disseminating information about such current publications, especially for materials published in the area itself, are inadequately developed, and a report on the relevant experience of libraries in the United States may be useful to university centers of teaching and research as well as to individual scholars.

Following discussion of the reports of six disciplinary subgroups on needed research in social science fields, the committee has initiated plans for a major conference on selected fields of research in Middle Eastern cultures to be held in the late spring.

RESEARCH TRAINING

Donald G. Marquis (chairman), Robert Dubin, Walter R. Goldschmidt, Arthur W. Macmahon, Frederick Mosteller, Thomas C. Schelling, Everett K. Wilson; staff, Elbridge Sibley.

Ezra Glaser of National Analysts, Inc. has been commissioned to survey the present situation and outlook for applications of electronic computers in social science research. His report, which is hoped for within the next few months, is expected to provide a basis for consideration of ways in which social scientists may be assisted in the exploitation of new techniques. Mr. Glaser, who was for many years on the staff of the Office of Statistical Standards in the Bureau of the Budget, has had wide experience among specialists in this field and was responsible for organizing a successful series of conferences on applications of computers held in Washington.

Electronic computers not long ago were virtually in the category of secret weapons, but without doubt will soon be as much of a necessity in some types of empirical and theoretical social research as mechanical calculators and tabulating machines are today. Not only can the new computers

vastly accelerate the arithmetical operations that social scientists have heretofore performed with less efficient equipment, but they also make practically feasible analyses that would otherwise be only theoretically possible. As tends to happen with any spectacularly new technique, electronic computation offers a temptation to become preoccupied with the technique for its own sake rather than with its applications. At the risk of being trite it may be well to observe that no computing machine can think an original thought; the layman's reference to "electronic brains" has no place in the grammar of social science. An assessment of the potential contribution of high-speed computers must take account not only of their prodigious speed but also of the fact that they can perform their operations only in strict accordance with highly formal rules; a scholar's creative imagination must be exercised both in planning the machine's work and in interpreting its output, but the machine itself can contribute no original insights whatever.

Comparatively few social scientists have gone far in exploring either the potential capacity of computers or the constraints inherent in translating significant social problems into multidimensional mathematical models adapted to mechanical manipulation. The Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists as well as the Committee on Research Training is concerned with the needs for new training that are emerging with the development of these new techniques of research.

Arrangements have been completed for the two research training institutes to be sponsored by the committee in the summer of 1957, as announced in the December issue of *Items*. For lists of the persons invited to attend these institutes, see pages 10-11 *infra*.

Two or three additional research institutes are contemplated for the summer of 1958. The Council would welcome suggestions concerning areas of research in which summer

institutes may be especially needed or desirable, as well as inquiries from individuals or departments interested in initiating proposals for such institutes.

SLAVIC STUDIES

(Joint with American Council of Learned Societies)

C. E. Black (chairman), William B. Edgerton (secretary), Abram Bergson, Merle Fainsod, H. H. Fisher, Chauncy D. Harris, Ernest J. Simmons, S. Harrison Thomson, René Wellek, Sergius Yakobson.

The Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Grants, consisting of Abram Bergson (chairman), William B. Ballis, Edward J. Brown, Oscar Halecki, and Chauncy D. Harris, met on November 17 to consider applications for subsidies to assist with publication of research manuscripts already accepted by publishers, under the program of grants for Slavic and East European studies which was initiated in 1956. Grants were made to Victor S. Mamatey, Associate Professor of History, Florida State University, for publication by the Princeton University Press of a study of Woodrow Wilson and the birth of the new nations of East Central Europe, 1914-18; to Leonard Newmark, Assistant Professor of English, Ohio State University, for publication by the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics of an outline of the structure of the Albanian (Tosk) language; and to Marc Raeff, Assistant Professor of History, Clark University, for publication by Martinus Nijhoff of a biography of M. M. Speransky, statesman of Imperial Russia. The subcommittee has also awarded the Program on East Central Europe at Columbia University a grant to assist in meeting the expenses of an interdisciplinary conference on Eastern European studies in American universities and other research organizations, to be held in June 1957.

PERSONNEL

DIRECTORS OF THE COUNCIL

The following persons have been designated by the seven national social science organizations associated with the Council to serve as directors of the Council for the three-year term 1957-59:

Gordon R. Willey, Harvard University, by the American Anthropological Association

William H. Nicholls, Vanderbilt University, by the American Economic Association

David M. Potter, Yale University, by the American Historical Association

Gabriel A. Almond, Princeton University, by the American Political Science Association

Carroll L. Shartle, Ohio State University, by the American Psychological Association

Robert E. L. Faris, University of Washington, by the American Sociological Society

Harold F. Dorn, National Institutes of Health, by the American Statistical Association.

The credentials of the new members are scheduled for acceptance by the board of directors of the Council at its spring meeting in New York on March 23-24, 1957.

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON AMERICAN GOVERNMENTAL PROCESSES

The Committee on Political Behavior—David B. Truman (chairman), Angus Campbell, Robert A. Dahl, Oliver Garceau, Alexander Heard, V. O. Key, Jr., Dayton D. McKean—at its meeting on January 11–12 awarded 10 grants for research on American governmental processes:

- George M. Belknap, Visiting Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, for research on leadership in urban affairs.
- J. Leiper Freeman, Jr., Assistant Professor of Political Science, Vanderbilt University, for research on careers of federal administrators in Tennessee.
- Charles S. Hyneman, Professor of Government, Indiana University, for research on the formation, adoption, and impact of legislative policy in Indiana.
- Avery Leiserson, Professor of Political Science, Vanderbilt University, for research on party organization in one- and two-party legislative districts.
- Dwaine Marvick, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles, for a study of active campaign workers in three districts of the Los Angeles metropolitan area (joint project with Charles R. Nixon).
- Herbert McClosky, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Minnesota, for research on factors in party choice and political belief.
- Richard P. McCormick, Professor of History, Rutgers University, for research on early American political behavior.
- Charles R. Nixon, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles, for a study of active campaign workers in three districts of the Los Angeles metropolitan area (joint project with Dwaine Marvick).
- Jack W. Peltason, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Illinois, for research on the role of federal district judges in implementing the decisions of the Supreme Court concerning desegregation.
- Peter H. Rossi, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago, for research on political processes in the local community.

GRANTS FOR FIELD STUDIES OF POLITICAL GROUPS IN FOREIGN AREAS

The Committee on Comparative Politics—Gabriel A. Almond (chairman), Taylor Cole, James S. Coleman, Sigmund Neumann, Guy J. Pauker, Lucian W. Pye, Walter R. Sharp—at its meeting on January 4–5 awarded 17 grants for field studies of political groups in foreign areas:

- Edward C. Banfield, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago, for research in Italy on relationships of ethos to group politics in a southern Italian village.
- Frank Brandenburg, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University, for research in Mexico on the role of interest groups in political processes.

Henry W. Ehrmann, Professor of Political Science, University of Colorado, for research in Europe on interest groups and the governmental process in France, Germany, and Italy.

Samuel J. Eldersveld, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan, for research in the Netherlands on the functional roles of pressure groups in the political process.

Federico G. Gil, Professor of Political Science, University of North Carolina, for research in Cuba on the contemporary transition in the pattern of group participation in Latin American politics.

Daniel Katz, Professor of Psychology, University of Michigan, for research in Norway on the impact of party activity upon political behavior.

Norman Kogan, Assistant Professor of Government, University of Connecticut, for research in Italy on the process of making foreign policy.

Joseph LaPalombara, Associate Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University, for research in Italy on interest group organization and political behavior in selected administrative settings within the bureaucracy.

Juan José Linz, Lecturer in Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, for research in Spain on society and politics.

Seymour M. Lipset, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, for research on the social determinants of support of political groups in Western democracies.

Val R. Lorwin, Assistant Professor of Social Sciences, University of Chicago, for research in Belgium on the relationships of trade unions and political parties.

Roy C. Macridis, Associate Professor of Political Science, Washington University, for research in France on political consensus with reference to group interaction and group ideology.

Douglas H. Mendel, Jr., Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles, for research in Japan on the relationship between policy objectives of organized interest groups and voters and the policies of two major political parties.

Albert G. Pickerell, Associate Professor of Journalism, University of California, Berkeley, for research in Thailand on the development of political groups.

Allen M. Potter, Lecturer in Government, University of Manchester, England, for research in Great Britain on the activities of pressure groups.

Fred W. Riggs, Associate Professor of Government, Indiana University, for research in Thailand on the political role of the bureaucracy.

Robert E. Scott, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Illinois, for research in Peru on political groups.

Myron Weiner, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago, for research in India on interest groups.

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON NATIONAL DEFENSE PROBLEMS, 1939–55

The Committee on National Security Policy Research—William T. R. Fox (chairman), Herbert Goldhamer, Henry A. Kissinger, Richard W. Leopold, G. A. Lincoln, John W. Masland, Arthur Smithies, Harold Stein—at its meeting on December 21, 1956 awarded 3 grants for research on national

defense problems, 1939-55, under the new program announced last June:

Morris Janowitz, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Michigan, for research on the professional soldier and political power, 1900-1950.

Laurence I. Radway, Assistant Professor of Government, Dartmouth College, for research in Europe on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Defense College and the coalition.

William Y. Smith, Assistant Professor of Economics, United States Military Academy, for a study of the National Security Council.

1957 SUMMER INSTITUTES IN MATHEMATICS

Selection of applicants for admission to the two institutes to be held at Stanford University, June 24 - August 17, 1957, under the auspices of the Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists was made at meetings of the following two subcommittees on February 9, 1957: for the Institute on Applications of Mathematics in Social Science Research, Robert R. Bush (chairman), Robert Dorfmann, E. P. Hutchinson, and Howard Raiffa; for the Institute on Mathematics in Social Science for College Teachers of Mathematics, co-sponsored by the Mathematical Association of America, Robert M. Thrall (chairman), John G. Kemeny, R. Duncan Luce, and Albert W. Tucker. The following social scientists and teachers of mathematics have been invited to attend the respective institutes:

Applications of Mathematics in Social Science Research

Norman H. Anderson, Ph.D. in psychology, University of Wisconsin, Research Training Fellow of the Council, 1956-57

Jarvis R. Bastian, Instructor in Psychology, University of Michigan

Philip W. Bell, Assistant Professor of Economics, Haverford College, Research Training Fellow of the Council, 1956-57

Daniel E. Berlyne, Senior Lecturer in Psychology, University of Aberdeen (on leave); Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

Vir G. Bhatia, graduate student in economics, Harvard University

Joseph D. Birch, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Michigan

Gordon H. Bower, graduate student in psychology, Yale University

Howard Brand, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Connecticut

Edward C. Carterette, Instructor in Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles

Michael R. D'Amato, Assistant Professor of Psychology, New York University

Jean Engler, graduate student in psychology, Northwestern University

John Fei, Assistant Professor of Economics, Antioch College

José Gallego-Díaz, Professor, School of Agricultural Engineering, Madrid, Spain

William L. Garrison, Assistant Professor of Geography, University of Washington

Murray Glanzer, Assistant Program Director (psychology), American Institute for Research

Juliet M. Gray, graduate student in psychology, Stanford University

John Haldi, Acting Instructor in Economics, Stanford University

Leonard M. Horowitz, graduate student in psychology, Johns Hopkins University

Charles W. Howe, Instructor in Economics, Stanford University

Robert L. Isaacson, Instructor in Psychology, University of Michigan

Anthony Y. C. Koo, Associate Professor of Economics, Michigan State University

Michael C. Lovell, graduate student in economics, Harvard University

Duane F. Marble, graduate student in economic geography, University of Washington

Robert McGinnis, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin

Maurice McManus, Instructor in Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Samuel J. Messick, Visiting Assistant Professor of Psychology, Princeton University

Gustav Ranis, Instructor in Economics, Yale University

Frank Restle, Instructor in Psychology, Michigan State University

Henry W. Riecken, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Minnesota

Walter A. Spivey, Assistant Professor of Statistics, University of Michigan

Donald W. Stilson, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of South Carolina

Hirofumi Uzawa, Research Associate, Applied Mathematics and Statistics Laboratory, Stanford University

Kellogg V. N. Wilson, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Duke University

Thomas P. Wilson, graduate student in sociology, Columbia University

William A. Wilson, Jr., Director, Department of Experimental Psychology, Institute of Living, Hartford, Conn.

Mathematics in Social Science for College Teachers of Mathematics

Augustus F. Bausch, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, University of Chicago

William A. Beck, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Bucknell University

May M. Beenken, Chairman, Department of Mathematics, Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles

Eva Boessmann, Assistant, Department of Economics, University of Frankfurt am Main (on leave); Fellow of the Rockefeller Foundation

Marjorie L. Browne, Professor of Mathematics, North Carolina College at Durham

Steven Bryant, Instructor in Mathematics, Fresno State College

William O. Buschman, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, California State Polytechnic College

Kermit H. Carlson, Chairman, Department of Mathematics, Valparaiso University

Evelyn Wiggin Casner, Professor of Mathematics, Randolph-Macon Woman's College
 Arthur A. Clarke, S.J., Instructor in Mathematics, Fordham University
 Ralph H. Coleman, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Evansville College
 Paolo Comba, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, University of Hawaii
 Randall M. Conkling, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts
 Mary P. Dolciani, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Hunter College
 William C. Doyle, Professor of Mathematics, Rockhurst College
 Richard D. Edwards, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, University of Pittsburgh
 John V. Finch, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Beloit College
 Bernard A. Fusaro, Instructor in Mathematics, Middlebury College
 Lofton L. Garner, Associate Professor of Mathematics, University of North Carolina
 Richard A. Good, Associate Professor of Mathematics, University of Maryland
 Cecil T. Holmes, Professor of Mathematics, Bowdoin College
 Roberta F. Johnson, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Wilson College
 Robert M. Kozelka, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, University of Nebraska
 Robert G. Kuller, Instructor in Mathematics, Wayne State University
 Abraham M. Mark, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Southern Illinois University
 Allen L. Mayerson, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, University of Michigan
 Frank J. McMackin, Associate Professor of Mathematics, St. Peters College, Jersey City
 N. C. Perry, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Alabama Polytechnic Institute
 Joseph C. Polley, Head, Mathematics Department, Wabash College
 Lyle E. Pursell, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Grinnell College
 Lawrence T. Ratner, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Vanderbilt University
 Gerson B. Robison, Instructor in Mathematics, University of Connecticut
 Jack U. Russell, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Southwestern at Memphis
 Leland L. Scott, Associate Professor of Mathematics, University of Mississippi
 Ben M. Seelbinder, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, University of Alabama
 Harold Slater, graduate student in mathematics, University of Michigan
 Carl J. Vanderlin, Jr., Instructor in Mathematics, Wisconsin State College, Whitewater
 Anthony E. Ventriglia, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Manhattan College
 Gerhard N. Wollan, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, Purdue University

SUMMER RESEARCH TRAINING INSTITUTES

Selection of applicants for admission to two research training institutes to be conducted during the summer of 1957, under the auspices of the Committee on Research Training, has been made by the following subcommittees: for the Institute on Organization Theory and Research to be held at Carnegie Institute of Technology, June 17 - July 26, Herbert A. Simon (chairman), Robert F. Bales, and Herbert A. Shepard; and for the Institute on Credit and Monetary Policy Research to be co-sponsored by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and held in Washington, D. C., June 24 - August 22, Emmanuel T. Weiler (chairman), Ben D. Lewis, and William S. Vickrey. The following persons have been invited to participate in the respective institutes:

Organization Theory and Research

Warren G. Bennis, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Boston University
 Robert L. Hamblin, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Iowa State College
 John C. Harsanyi, Lecturer in Economics, University of Queensland, Australia (on leave); Rockefeller Fellow, Stanford University
 Norman Kaplan, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Cornell University
 John T. Lanzetta, Associate Research Professor, Fels Group Dynamics Center, University of Delaware
 Harold J. Leavitt, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Chicago
 Edith M. Lentz, Assistant Professor, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota
 Solomon B. Levine, Associate Professor of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois
 Julius Margolis, Lecturer in Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley
 John C. Pock, Instructor in Sociology and Psychology, Reed College
 John H. Romani, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Western Michigan College
 Charles K. Warriner, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Kansas

Credit and Monetary Policy Research

Joseph Aschheim, Assistant Professor of Economics, Johns Hopkins University
 Alice Bourneuf, Associate Professor of Economics, Mount Holyoke College
 Deane C. Carson, Assistant Professor of Economics, Brown University
 Jacob Cohen, Associate Professor of Economics, Bowling Green State University
 H. Jerome Cranmer, Associate Professor of Economics, Drew University
 George Horwich, Assistant Professor of Economics, Purdue University

Norman H. Leonard, Jr., Professor of Economics, Ohio Wesleyan University
 Armando Maglaque, Senior Economist (Finance), Philippines National Economic Council, Manila
 Charles A. Matthews, Professor of Finance, University of Florida
 Raymond H. McEvoy, Assistant Professor of Economics, Montana State University
 Bogdan Mieczkowski, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Vermont
 Murray E. Polakoff, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Texas
 Emmett J. Rice, Instructor in Economics, Cornell University
 Claus W. Ruser, Instructor in Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Frederick E. Balderston of the University of California and C. Addison Hickman of North Carolina State College have been appointed to the Committee on Business Enterprise Research, succeeding Robert Dubin and J. Fred Weston.

Roy F. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania has been appointed to the Committee on Historical Analysis.

Herman P. Miller of the Bureau of the Census has been designated to serve as secretary to the Advisory Committee on Historical Statistics.

Leona Baumgartner of the New York City Department of Health has been appointed to the Committee on Preventive Medicine and Social Science Research.

PUBLICATIONS

COUNCIL MONOGRAPHS

Migration and Mental Disease: A Study of First Admissions to Hospitals for Mental Disease, New York, 1939-1941, by Benjamin Malzberg and Everett S. Lee, with an introduction by Dorothy S. Thomas. Sponsored by the Committee on Migration Differentials. March 1956. 152 pages. \$1.50.

Labor Mobility in Six Cities, prepared by Gladys L. Palmer, with the assistance of Carol P. Brainerd, for the Committee on Labor Market Research. June 1954. 191 pages. Paper, \$2.25; cloth, \$2.75.

Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research, edited by Edmund H. Volkart. June 1951. 348 pages. Cloth, \$3.00.

Support for Independent Scholarship and Research, by Elbridge Sibley. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council. May 1951. 131 pages. \$1.25.

COUNCIL BULLETINS

Research on Labor Mobility: An Appraisal of Research Findings in the United States, Bulletin 65, by Herbert S. Parnes. October 1954. 216 pages. \$1.75.

The Social Sciences in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography, Bulletin 64. July 1954. 191 pages. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness: A Survey of the Social Psychology of Physique and Disability, Bulletin 55, revised edition, by Roger G. Barker, in collaboration with Beatrice A. Wright, Lee Meyerson, Mollie R. Gonick. April 1953. 456 pages. \$2.00.

Area Research: Theory and Practice, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 183 pages. \$1.50.

Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1938; reprinted 1950. 116 pages. \$1.00.

Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pages. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

COUNCIL PAMPHLETS

The Business Enterprise as a Subject for Research, Pamphlet 11, by Howard R. Bowen. Sponsored by the Committee on Business Enterprise Research. May 1955. 111 pages. \$1.25.

Bibliographies on Personality and Social Development of the Child, Pamphlet 10, compiled by Christoph Heinicke and Beatrice B. Whiting. June 1953. 138 pages. \$1.00.

Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education, Pamphlet 9, by Guy S. Métraux. June 1952. 58 pages. 50 cents.

The Council's monographs, bulletins, and pamphlets are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

These volumes are sponsored by the Committee on Census Monographs in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census, and are published by John Wiley & Sons, New York:

American Agriculture: Its Structure and Place in the Economy, by Ronald L. Mighell. April 1955. 199 pages. Cloth, \$5.00.

Income of the American People, by Herman P. Miller. October 1955. 222 pages. Cloth, \$5.50.

Immigrants and Their Children, 1850-1950, by E. P. Hutchinson. August 1956. 405 pages. Cloth, \$6.50.

Social Characteristics of Urban and Rural Communities, 1950, by Otis Dudley Duncan and Albert J. Reiss, Jr. October 1956. 458 pages. Cloth, \$6.50.

American Families, by Paul C. Glick. February 1957. 254 pages. Cloth, \$6.00.

American Housing and Its Use: The Demand for Shelter Space, by Louis Winnick, with the assistance of Ned Shilling. March 1957. 157 pages. Cloth, \$5.50.

CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION MONOGRAPHS

These monographs are sponsored by the Committee on Cross-Cultural Education and are published by the University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis:

The American Experience of Swedish Students: Retrospect and Aftermath, by Franklin D. Scott. June 1956. 142 pages. Cloth, \$3.00.

Indian Students on an American Campus, by Richard D. Lambert and Marvin Bressler. December 1956. 133 pages. Cloth, \$3.00.

No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States, by Ralph L. Beals and Norman D.

Humphrey. May or June 1957. About 164 pages. Cloth, \$3.25.

OTHER BOOKS

Economic Growth: Brazil, India, Japan, edited by Simon Kuznets, Wilbert E. Moore, and Joseph J. Spengler. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1955. 626 pages. Cloth, \$12.50.

Social Forces in the Middle East: Papers Presented at a Conference Sponsored by the Committee on the Near and Middle East, edited by Sydney N. Fisher. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, September 1955. 298 pages. Cloth, \$5.00.

ANNOUNCEMENT

FULBRIGHT GRANTS IN SOUTHEAST

ASIA, THE PACIFIC AREA, LATIN

AMERICA, AND THE NEAR EAST

The Committee on International Exchange of Persons, appointed by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, has announced that the competition for 1958-59 awards for university lecturing and advanced research under the Fulbright Act (Public Law 584) will be held from March 1 to April 25, 1957. Early in March the committee will issue a booklet listing the awards for the following countries of Southeast Asia and the Pacific: Australia, Burma, India, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand. Awards for the following Latin American countries will be listed: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru.

There will also be a small number of 1957-58 awards under the recently negotiated Fulbright agreements with Argentina, Israel, and Turkey. April 25, 1957 is the closing date for submitting applications for all these programs. Application forms and detailed information on all programs may be obtained from the address given below.

In addition, the committee has announced that 1958-59 grants for lecturing abroad under the Smith-Mundt Act (Public Law 402) will be available in approximately forty countries that do not participate in the Fulbright Program—in Latin America, the Near East and Africa, the Far East, and Europe. Persons interested in these countries should communicate with the committee at the following address: Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington 25, D. C.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1957: GABRIEL A. ALMOND, TAYLOR COLE, HAROLD F. DORN, FRED EGGAN, ROBERT E. L. FARIS, R. A. GORDON, LOUIS GOTTSCHALK, PENDLETON HERRING, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, LYLE H. LANIER, EARL LATHAM, DONALD G. MARQUIS, JOHN PERRY MILLER, PHILIP E. MOSELY, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, FRANK C. NEWMAN, WILLIAM H. NICHOLLS, DAVID M. POTTER, CARROLL L. SHARTLE, RICHARD H. SHRYOCK, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, CONRAD TAEUBER, ROBERT L. THORNDIKE, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, RALPH J. WATKINS, GORDON R. WILLEY, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR., C. VANN WOODWARD, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; CATHERINE V. RONNAN, *Financial Secretary*